

No. 10972-4Lab-75/30308.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the Management of M/s Bishwa Nath Industries Limited, 14th Mile Stone, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 73 of 1975

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BISHWA NATH INDUSTRIES,
LIMITED 14TH MILE STONE, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present —

Nemo, for the workman.

Shri Murli Dhar for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/75/19275, dated 26th March, 1975, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Bishwa Nath Industries, Limited, 14th Mile Stone, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workmen to this Tribunal in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

- (1) Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of dearness allowances ? If so, with what details ?
- (2) Whether the grades and scales of pay of workers should be fixed ? If so, with what details ?
- (3) Whether the workmen should be supplied with uniforms ? If so, with what details ?

I find on perusal of the record that Shri R. N. Roy, representative for the workman, filed his application, dated 12th June, 1975 praying for permission to withdraw the present dispute. He stated that the workman would re-draft the demand notice and serve it on the management and the same had come up before the Conciliation Officer on 28th April 1975.

It is obvious that the workmen do not propose to press their demand the subject of the reference, I as such return an award of no dispute between the parties on the demand found attached with the reference.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated 20th August, 1975.

No. 10886-4Lab-75/30310.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Accurex Optica Metal Industries, Jagadhri.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 79 of 1975

between

MISS VIMAL SHARMA AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ACCUREX OPTICA INDUSTRIES,
JAGADHRI

AWARD

By order No. ID/Amh 220-G-75/34225-29, dated 4th June, 1975, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Accurex Optica Industries, Jagadhri, and its worker Miss Vimal Sharma was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of services of Miss Vimal Sharma was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is she entitled ?”

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties, the management put in their appearance before me on 11th September, 1975 through one Dinesh Bansal a partner of the concern. The worker however, did not appear on that date despite being personally served with the notice through registered post.

Shri Dinesh Bansal appearing for the management produced a settlement Exhibit M. 1 alleged to have been arrived at between the parties with an agreement that the management shall pay a sum of Rs. 158.25 to the worker in full and final satisfaction of her claim. He also produced a copy of the receipt Exhibit M. 2 indicating the payment of Rs. 158.25 to the worker. He proved both these documents as correct, by making his own statement.

I see no reason to disbelieve Shri Bansal particularly when the worker has failed to appear despite service of notice of reference, thus indicating her want of interest in pursuing her demand.

I accordingly relying on the statement of Shri Dinesh Bansal hold that the claim arising out of the demand of the worker has since been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I return a not dispute award with no order as to costs.

Dated the 17th September, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 10884-4Lab-75/30312 —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Accurex Optica Industries, Jagadhri.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 82 of 1975

between

MISS SAROJ BALA, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ACCUREX OPTICA INDUSTRIES,
JAGADHRI

AWARD

By order No. ID/Amb/220-75/34220-24, dated 4th June, 1975 of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Accurex Optica Industries, Jagadhri, and its worker Miss Saroj Bala was referred for adjudication to this Court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of services of Miss Saroj Bala was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?”

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties, the management put in their appearance before me on 11th September, 1975 through one Dinesh Bansal a partner of the concern. The worker however, did not appear on that date despite being personally served with the demand notice through registered post.

Shri Dinesh Bansal appearing for the management produced a settlement Ex M. 1 alleged to have been arrived at between the parties with an agreement that the management shall pay a sum of Rs 392 to the worker in full and final satisfaction of her claim. He also produced a copy of the receipt Ex. M. 2 indicating the payment of Rs 392 to the worker. He proved both these documents as correct, by making his own statement.

I see no reason to disbelieve Shri Bansal particularly when the worker has failed to appear despite service of notice of reference, thus indicating her want of interest in pursuing her demand.

I accordingly relying on the statement of Shri Dinesh Bansal hold that the claim arising out of the demand of the worker has since been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I return a no-dispute award with no order as to costs.

Dated, the 17th September, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2397, dated 18th September, 1975

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 10882-4Lab-75/30314. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Accurex Optica Industries Jagadhri.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 81 of 1975

between

MISS KUMAD, BALA AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ACCUREX OPTICA INDUSTRIES
JAGADHRI

AWARD

By Order No. ID/AMB/220/75/54237-41, dated 4th August, 1975, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Accurex Optica Industries, Jagadhri and its worker Miss Kumad Bala was referred for adjudication to this Court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Miss Kumad Bala was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties, the management put in their appearance before me on 11th September, 1975 through one Dinesh Bansal a partner of the concern. The worker however, did not appear on that date despite being personally served with the notice through registered post.

Shri Dinesh Bansal appearing for the management produced a settlement Ex. M. 1 alleged to have been arrived at between the parties with an agreement that the management shall pay a sum of Rs 309.75 to the worker in full and final satisfaction of her claim. He also produced a copy of the receipt Ex. M. 2 indicating the payment of Rs 309.75 to the worker. He proved both these documents as correct, by making his own statement.

I see no reason to disbelieve Shri Bansal particularly when the worker has failed to appear despite service of notice of reference, thus indicating her want of interest in pursuing her demand.

I accordingly relying on the statement of Shri Dinesh Bansal hold that the claim arising out of the demand of the worker has since been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I return a dispute award with no order as to costs.

Dated 17th September, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 2378, Dated 18th September, 1975

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employments, Departments Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.